


required to respond to a late-filed dispositive motion. (*Id.* at 1-2, 6.) Plaintiff argues that the core issues in this case surround her "gross misconduct resignation" from TDOS that has prevented her from obtaining subsequent employment, and thus, Defendants' dispositive motion would be futile based on the case law they cite. (*Id.* at 6.)

The Court finds that Defendants' failure to explain why they were unable to file their dispositive motion within the Court's filing deadlines and to address any prejudice to Plaintiff by an untimely dispositive counsels against allowing it. In addition, this case is scheduled to be tried on August 27, 2013, thus, allowing dispositive motions to be filed would likely result in trial being postponed. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** the Motion.

It is so ORDERED.

This the 3rd day of June, 2013.



JOHN T. NIXON, SENIOR JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT